IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2768 OF 2003

IN

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 375 OF 1995

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3432 OF 1991

Purshottam Yashwant Rudraksha ...Petitioners
Versus
Managing Officer and Ors. ....Respondents

Rajesh S.Datar, Adv for the petitioners.

CORAM: S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.

23.11.2007

P.C. :

1. The service is already complete as per the office report. Respondent nos.1 to 5 are the State authorities whereas Respondent no.6 is a private party who has been served as per the office report.

2. There is no affidavit-in-reply opposing the Civil Application. The Civil Application sets out the sufficient cause for the petitioner not being able to comply with the office objections. Considering the

office objections and the fact that they are now being complied with, the Civil Application is granted in terms of prayer clause (a) and (b). Office to proceed accordingly. However the petitioner to pay costs quantified at Rs.1500/- to the Maharashtra State Legal Services Authority within a period of two weeks from today. On proof of costs being paid is produced the Registry to place the Writ petition for hearing and final disposal.

3. For the very same reasons, Civil Application No. 375 of 1995 is also allowed and as directed above, the Office to proceed and place the Writ Petition for hearing and final disposal, after costs are paid and proof is produced. Civil Applications allowed accordingly.

sd/-

****